

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	10.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,695		08/07/2002	Adrian Hilary Berry	201-0690	9320
28549	7590	05/17/2004		EXAMINER	
KEVIN			STONE, JENNIFER A		
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C. 28333 TELEGRAPH ROAD, SUITE 250 SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2636	
					•

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004



Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/064,695	BERRY ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Jennifer A Stone	2636	
Th	e MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
Therefore, fu final rejection condition for	FILED 26 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THURSHOP TO PLACE THURSHOP TO PLACE THURSHOP THE PRINCE OF A PRICE OF A PRI	void abandonment of this application to the same of this application and the same of the s	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	
	PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
_	period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of		·	
even ONL 706.0 Extensions have been filed it 37 CFR 1.17(a) (b) above, if chec	period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv t, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th Y CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 07(f). of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten- is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened cked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo- rm adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee the interest of the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	
	ice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'R 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The pr	roposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) 🔲 th	ney raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) 🔲 th	ney raise the issue of new matter (see Note to	pelow);		
	ey are not deemed to place the application sues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) 🔲 t	hey present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
1	IOTE:			
3. Applic	ant's reply has overcome the following rejec	etion(s):		
	proposed or amended claim(s) would ling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment	
	affidavit, b) \square exhibit, or c) \square request fo ation in condition for allowance because: \underline{Se}		sidered but does NOT place the	
	ffidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed I by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
	rposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment nation of how the new or amended claims w			
The st	atus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim	n(s) allowed: none.			
	n(s) objected to: none.			
	n(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .			
	n(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
	rawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
	he attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
		, - I \ - \ - \ - \ - \ - \ - \ - \		

JEFFERY HOFSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEF
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: examiner maintains all rejections stated in the final rejection. In addition, examiner recognizes that Chart 1 is not prior art, but is based on a prior art reference to exemplify that DeZorzi receives a speed signal corresponding to a vehicle speed to measure speed according to three predetermined speed modes. Furthermore, examiner has addressed that DeZorzi teaches generating warning statuses for each tire in a rolling location, a spare location, and an auxilliary location in the rejection of claims 1 and 2 where the controller (col 4, lns 4-7) is coupled by wireless means to each transmitter module (Fig. 1, items 14, 16, and 18). The controller provides warning statuses based on the data messages from the transmitters in each spare, auxilliary, and rolling location.